

4-1-2014

April 1, 2014

Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, "April 1, 2014" (2014). *Minutes*. 1038.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/facsen_mins/1038

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Minutes by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES FOR 1 APRIL 2014

The 2013- 2014 Faculty Senate agendas, minutes, and other information are available on the Web at: <http://castle.eiu.edu/facsen/>

Note: These minutes are not a complete verbatim transcript of the Senate meeting.

- I. Call to Order by Chair Grant Sterling at 2:01pm (Booth Library, Room 4440)** Present: J. Ashley, T. Burns, J. Conwell, M. Dao, S. Knight-Davis, J. Ludlow, M. Mulvaney, J. Oliver, K. Padmaraju, J. Robertson, A. Rosenstein, S. Scher, G. Sterling, K. English.

Guests: Provost Lord, Dean Jackman (CEPS), Dr. Jeff Cross (Academic Affairs), Dr. Jill Owen, Dr. Hasan Mavi, Dr. Chris Laingen, Ms. Kim Ervin, Jason Howell (DEN)

II. Approval of Minutes of 18 March, 2014

Minutes from the 18 March, 2014 meeting were approved. Motion made by Senator Conwell and seconded by Senator Dao. Senator Rosenstein abstained.

III. Announcements

- 1) Faculty Forum at 3:30 pm – Senator Sterling noted that the Senate will adjourn in time for the Faculty Forum.
- 2) Faculty Senate/UPI Faculty Retirees Reception: April 23, 3:30, Tarble Arts Center

IV. Communications

- a. 3/6/14 CAA Minutes – No action needed
- b. 3/13/14 CAA Minutes - No action needed
- c. e-mail from Stephen Lucas, re: Syllabus Policy Revisions – Senator Sterling noted that the revisions were made in the policy in response to the comments made by the Faculty Senators.
- d. attachment: Syllabus Policy Current and Draft Revision
- e. 3 attachments, re: CAA learning Goals

- IV.** Presentation to the Senate: Dr. Jeff Cross, e-Portfolios – Dr. Cross thanked the Senate for invitation to talk about the online faculty evaluation option. He mentioned that at present a limited pilot was going on, but the evaluations for that process were yet to be completed. Two things he wanted to emphasize were that it was online and that it was an option. When this whole process was being thought about, he had received some concerns from Senator Sterling which he was going to address in today's presentation.

One of the main concerns raised was about security. Dr. Cross noted that the development group involved in the process had from the very initial stages kept the security and the integrity of the process at least equal to the paper process we have in place now. The technology has also been kept up to date by using D2L, the current course management system.

Another issue was related to the erasing of the information after the evaluation period. Dr. Cross informed the Senate that the access to the materials for each evaluating body will be terminated after their evaluation period had ended. While the faculty member will continue to have the materials still stored in the portfolio, the access for the evaluators will be limited to the time they needed the access. Senator Ashley asked if there would be guidelines for the size as we have for the paper format, to which Dr. Cross replied that there would be and that these

would be tweaked through the evaluation process. He added that this whole process came together on the request of some faculty who wanted to have this option. Mrs. Kim Ervin has provided a lot of the technical support in creating this option on D2L. Senator Ashley asked what would happen if D2L made some changes in the middle of the semester, like he had seen recently. Kim Ervin replied that the e-portfolio was a different component of D2L, other than the course component. Dr. Cross added that the whole team was committed to provide support with whatever technical assistance faculty needed if they chose this option. The faculty who were piloting this had been saying that it was easier to do this now, as most of the materials are now in the electronic format.

Dr. Cross continued saying that the security and integrity of the process is completely dependent on the people using the system, just like it is now for the paper-based system. Senator Padmaraju asked if faculty could build the portfolio throughout the year to which Dr. Cross replied that it was definitely set up that way. He added that they had started looking into this option in October last year, had examined the feasibility of using D2L and had found out that D2L did have an e-portfolio option that would work well for the parameters that we have in place. A model was put together, called a proof of concept model and some faculty put in some examples to see if the model worked well for moving through the various stages of the evaluation process with the different evaluating bodies and if it would scale through multiple years. Paper guides had also been developed and shared and evaluator workshops had been held in November for DPCs, and UPC. As this was done in November, a refresher was done in January for the same people. During these workshops, about half of the evaluators liked the process and half did not. In the demonstration, Dr. Cross shared two perspectives, the faculty perspective as to how they can submit materials and the evaluator perspective as to how they can access materials. He added that the e-portfolio was not linked to any course and there was a direct log-in for the members who can dump materials in each section in the template. Each of the materials could be bookmarked and as PDFs, they were also entirely searchable. A faculty member who was piloting this shared that he built the portfolio just like he would build a paper one. Senator Oliver mentioned that quite a bit of evidence he included in his portfolio were emails. He asked if there was an option for him to get the emails into a PDF format rather than copying it into Word and then saving as PDF, so as to ensure the authenticity of it. Dr. Cross and Ms. Ervin both replied that it was a possibility. Dr. Cross added that one of the things, the pilot has helped develop is a template. Each department will have a course and the DPC members will be enrolled as faculty in it and will have access to instructions for faculty evaluation. Senator Ashley asked if the department chairs will need to provide that access each year. Dr. Cross replied that currently, he was collecting that information from the chairs. Senator Ludlow asked if a faculty member could pull materials from each year when they needed to put together a tenure or a promotion portfolio. She was concerned that if the materials went away after the evaluation period, how she would be able to get to them. Dr. Cross clarified that the materials will always be available to the faculty member preparing the portfolio but the access to the evaluators will be limited. Senator Bruns asked if evaluators will be able to print out materials. Dr. Cross replied that he was recommending that faculty use the option of making their files such that they cannot be downloaded or printed. Senator Oliver asked if that could be a default setting so it was not dependent on the faculty to do it. Dr. Cross replied that he will look into the possibility. He also added that one of the advantages of using D2L was that every step was logged. Senator Bruns asked if he would be able to see the logs if he suspected that changes had been made. Dr. Cross replied that the access will have to be requested, it was not automatic. He further added that the integrity of the process is completely dependent on the people using the system.

Dr. Cross then shared the evaluator perspective by showing the forms that they would be using and how they could be signed digitally. He added that they chose the Adobe Acrobat format as it had the digital signature option. There were options for signature by text or by a graphic image. Once an evaluator had signed and submitted, the evaluation could not be changed. If any changes needed to be made, the evaluator would have to add an addendum or do another evaluation form.

Senator Bruns enquired about what would happen if there was a catastrophe. He understood that Dr. Cross may not have the answers to this as this was still at a pilot stage, but he wanted to know if the team had looked into this. Would he lose all the data if there was a catastrophe. Ms. Ervin replied that there was an option on D2L to back up files. Senator Bruns said that then it should be noted that the best practice was to back up files. He added that he was not as concerned about integrity breach from inside but what about hacking from outside. Ms. Ervin replied that it was as safe as the system could be. Senator Bruns added that he hoped that it would remain an option and that faculty will not be pressurized to choose this option by their peers. Dr. Cross replied that he thinks that in the foreseeable future it will be an individual choice.

Senator Ludlow asked if the system was Mac friendly, to which Ms. Ervin replied in the affirmative. Senator Conwell asked how access would be granted to Alternates on DPCs. Dr. Cross said it could be done. Senator Mulvaney commended Dr. Cross and his team on completing this process of developing a pilot in a timely manner and asked when this would be available to all faculty to use. Dr. Cross replied that it was at a pilot stage right now, and it will not be fully available for at least another year. The team wanted to look at all possible issues before going full scale and making it available to all faculty. Senator Rosenstein asked if there would be studies to compare the evaluation done electronically vs. being done on paper. What steps was the team taking to have this comparison. Dr. Cross replied that they were not that far yet and Ms. Ervin added that they had been asking the evaluators if they felt the process was smooth and does not lead to frustration for the evaluators. The format that had been put together was a result of that concern. Senator Dao asked what the course of action would be if one of the evaluators on DPC or UPC did not want to evaluate an online portfolio. Dr. Cross replied that one of the characteristics of the evaluation process was that there are multiple stages and if there were some issues at one stage, they can be corrected at other stages.

VI. Old Business

A. Committee Reports

1. Executive Committee – Senator Oliver reported that the committee had met with the President who remained optimistic in spite of the challenges that we are facing.
2. Nominations Committee: Replacement for Student Pub. Board - Senator Knight-Davis reported that a vacancy on the Student Publication Board needed to be filled. After she revisited the pool, only Kathryn Bulver was eligible to serve out this year and the next year. The two options the Senate had were to either appoint her for this year only or to appoint her to replace the outgoing member for the whole term that was till the end of next year.

Senator Mulvaney asked what we had done in the past. Senator Sterling replied that we had appointed them for the whole term. Senator Mulvaney moved to appoint Kathryn Bulver for the whole remainder of the term. The Motion was seconded by Senator Bruns and approved unanimously.

Senator Knight-Davis noted that the nominations list remains unchanged from last meeting due to this approval.

3. Elections Committee: Ratifying Spring Election Results – Senator Oliver reported that the voting percentage this year of 41 % was higher than the prior years. He congratulated the Senators who got relected to various bodies. He noted that Senator Rosenstein had been elected to both the Senate and CFR but due to the by-laws as discussed during the previous meeting, she will need to decide which one she wanted to serve on. Senator Oliver added that there were still some positions that remained unfilled; he was especially concerned about the UPC at-large position that remained unfilled. There were 20 write-in candidates for that one but none of them got more than the required 10 votes.

There was also a tie for the UPC position from COS based on write-in votes. The by-laws state that we need to have a coin flip in front of both the candidates to decide. But since both the candidates could serve, one as COS representative and the other as at-large representative, Senator Oliver asked the Senate to approve the selection to be made by the Elections committee at a later time. Senator Ashley so moved and the motion carried through after being seconded by Senator Conwell.

Senator Conwell moved to approve the election results and this was seconded by Senator Mulvaney. Motion carried through with all in favor of the motion.

4. Faculty-Student Relations Committee - No report
5. Faculty-Staff Relations Committee - No report
6. Awards Committee - No report
7. Faculty Forum Committee: Meeting today... - Senator Rosenstein urged the Senators to come for the Forum where CUPB members would be sharing some details about the program analysis that CUPB sub-committees had undertaken.
8. Budget Transparency Committee: CUPB and Senate - No report
9. Committee on Committees - No report
10. Constitution/By-laws Revision - No report
11. Other Reports
 - a. Provost's Report – Provost Lord thanked faculty who had come for the Admitted Student Day on the previous Saturday and noted that the format was well received by the prospective students and their families. Particularly strong comments had been received for the classroom presentations. He announced that there was an IBHE meeting that day and also noted that the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting agenda had not yet been finalized. He mentioned that he was nearing completion of the process that he had undertaken with the transitions in leadership and he would be announcing the details soon. The search for Admissions Director was ongoing and the committee was looking at a new pool of candidates.

b. Other – None

- B. Other Old Business: None
- VII. New Business

A. Future Agenda:

Spring 2014 Meeting Dates – April 15 (CUPB-Program Analysis); April 29 (Admissions)

B. Other New Business –

- VIII. Adjournment at 3:20 pm